UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/674,577	09/29/2003	Sathyanarayana Nagendra Puttu	50325-0797	5403

29989 7590 07/17/2008

HICKMAN PALERMO TRUONG & BECKER, LLP
2055 GATEWAY PLACE
SUITE 550
SAN JOSE, CA 95110

EXAMINER	
ANYA, CHARLES E	

ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
2194	

MAIL DATE	DELIVERY MODE
07/17/2008	PAPER

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

Office Action Summary	Application No.	Applicant(s)	
	10/674,577	PUTTU ET AL.	
	Examiner	Art Unit	
	Charles E. Anya	2194	

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE *3/* MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

1)☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on *22 April 2008*.

2a)☒ This action is **FINAL**. 2b)☐ This action is non-final.

3)☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

4)☒ Claim(s) *16-22,38-44,60-66 and 82-88* is/are pending in the application.

4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.

5)☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.

6)☒ Claim(s) *16-22,38-44,60-66 and 82-88* is/are rejected.

7)☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.

8)☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

9)☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.

10)☐ The drawing(s) filed on _____ is/are: a)☐ accepted or b)☐ objected to by the Examiner.

Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).

Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).

11)☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

12)☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).

a)☐ All b)☐ Some * c)☐ None of:

1.☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.

2.☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.

3.☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

1) ☒ Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)
2) ☐ Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)
3) ☐ Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO/SB/08) Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____.
4) ☐ Interview Summary (PTO-413) Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____ .
5) ☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application
6) ☐ Other: _____.

DETAILED ACTION

1. Claims 16-22,38-44,60-66 and 82-88 are pending in this application.

Claim Objections

2. Claims 60-66 are objected to because of the following informalities:

Claim 60 include "means for" however, is not clear what constitutes the "means for" (i.e. it is not whether the "means for" is software, hardware or both). Appropriate correction is required.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 102

3. he following is a quotation of the appropriate paragraphs of 35 U.S.C. 102 that form the basis for the rejections under this section made in this Office action:

> A person shall be entitled to a patent unless –
>
> (b) the invention was patented or described in a printed publication in this or a foreign country or in public use or on sale in this country, more than one year prior to the date of application for patent in the United States.

4. Claims 16,18,21,22,38,40,43,44,60,62,65,66,82,84,87 and 88 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(b) as being anticipated by U.S. Pat. No. 5,737,518 Grover et al.

5. As to claim 16, Grover teaches a method for verifying information on a managed device, comprising: receiving, from a requester ("…manager software…" Col. 5 Ln. 16, "…management station…" Col. 6 Ln. 30 – 45) that stores an incorrect attribute value for an SNMP MIB object ("…failure…" Col. 3 Ln. 1 – 34) and is unable to read and write the SNMP object directly ("…agent software…must prevent manager software from writing…." Col. 5 Ln. 12 – 17, "…agent software's responsibility to ensure that the object allows write access…" Col. 6 Ln. 30 – 41) and that does not have a correct value for the SNMP MIB object ("…failure…" Col. 3 Ln. 1 – 34), a SNMP GET request identifying an SNMP MIB object and also containing one or more non-null values comprising proposals for a correct value of the SNMP MIB object ("…an object query request…" Col. 3 Ln. 21 – 35, "…query…" Col. 6 Ln. 30 – 34, "…query command…" Col. 7 Ln. 57 – 63, "…object query requests…" Col. 11 Ln. 56 – 60); wherein the SNMP GET request requests a determination as to whether any of the one or more values match the correct value stored in the SNMP MIB object of the managed device, determining whether any of the one or more values match the correct value stored in the SNMP MIB object ("…examining…" Col. 1 Ln. 31 – 44, "…test signal…" Col. 3 Ln. 21 – 35, Col. 3 Ln. 48 – 55, Col. 6 Ln. 19 – 25); and completing execution of the SNMP GET request by: transmitting a notification message indicating whether any of the one or more values match the correct value of the SNMP MIB object ("…message indicating an error…" Col. 1 Ln. 41 – 44, "…failure is reported…" Col. 3 Ln. 8 – 11, "…an error is returned…" Col. 6 Ln. 39 – 45) and without providing the correct value in response to the SNMP

GET request ("…message indicating an error…" Col. 1 Ln. 41 – 44, "…failure is reported…" Col. 3 Ln. 8 – 11, "…an error is returned…" Col. 6 Ln. 39 – 45).

6. As to claim 18, Grover teaches the method of Claim 16, wherein a specification for the SNMP MIB object is not generally available ("…valid value…" Col. 6 Ln. 39 – 45, "…attribute read-write…" Col. 8 Ln. 16 – 21).

7. As to claim 21, Grover teaches the method of Claim 16, wherein the determining step results in determining that none of the one or more values match the correct value of the SNMP MIB object ("…examining…" Col. 1 Ln. 31 – 44, "…test signal…" Col. 3 Ln. 21 – 35, Col. 3 Ln. 48 – 55, Col. 6 Ln. 19 – 25), and wherein the transmitting step comprises transmitting a notification message that includes an error message that describes an encountered problem in determining whether the one or more values match the correct value of the SNMP MIB object ("…message indicating an error…" Col. 1 Ln. 41 – 44, "…failure is reported…" Col. 3 Ln. 8 – 11, "…an error is returned…" Col. 6 Ln. 39 – 45).

8. As to claim 22, Grover teaches the method as recited in Claim 16, wherein the transmittal step comprises the step of storing, in a specified MIB object of the managed device, a notification value indicating whether any of the one or more values match the correct value of the SNMP MIB object ("…report…stored in a file…" Col. 8 Ln. 1 – 9).

9. As to claims 38,60, and 82, see the rejection of claim 16 above.

10. As to claims 40,62, and 84, see the rejection of claim 18 above.

11. As to claims 43,65, and 87, see the rejection of claim 21 above.

12. As to claims 44,66, and 88, see the rejection of claim 22 above.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

13. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

> (a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negatived by the manner in which the invention was made.

14. Claim 17 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over U.S. Pat. No. 5,737,518 Grover et al. in view of U.S. Pat. No. 6,697,970 B1 to Chisholm.

15. As to claim 17, Grover is silent with reference to the method of Claim 16, wherein the notification message identifies, using an index position and not the correct value,

which one of the one or more values match the correct value stored in the SNMP MIB object.

Chisholm teaches the method of Claim 16, wherein the notification message identifies, using an index position and not the correct value, which one of the one or more values match the correct value stored in the SNMP MIB object (figure 5A Col. 6 Ln. 1 – 8).

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to modify the system of Grover with the teaching of Chisholm because the teaching of Chisholm would improve the system of Grover by providing data structure used for information retrieval that enables rapid identification of information and thus improves performance during information lookup.

16. Claims 20,42,64, and 86 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over U.S. Pat. No. 5,737,518 Grover et al. in view of WhitePaper: IronShield Best Practices Hardening Foundry Routers & Switches to Kwan.

17. As to claim 20, Grover is silent with reference to the method of Claim 16, wherein the SNMP MIB object stores a username or a password for one member of the following group consisting of: a telnet protocol, a SSH protocol, a TFTP protocol, a RCP protocol, a SNMP protocol, a TACACS protocol, and a RADIUS protocol.

Kwan teaches the method of Claim 16, wherein the SNMP MIB object stores a username or a password for one member of the following group consisting of: a telnet

protocol, a SSH protocol, a TFTP protocol, a RCP protocol, a SNMP protocol, a TACACS protocol, and a RADIUS protocol (pages 16,23,27,28,31,34,36,37,41,44,45,50,53).

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to modify the system of Grover with the teaching of Kwan because the teaching of Kwan would improve the system of Grover by providing basic access security so as to protect devices against unauthorized access and usage (Kwan page 14).

18. As to claims 42,64 and 86, see the rejection of claim 20 above.

Response to Arguments

Applicant's arguments filed 4/22/08 have been fully considered but they are not persuasive. Also of note is that the Narayan prior art has been withdrawn.

Applicant argues in substance that the Grover prior art does not teach or suggest “a requester that stores an incorrect attribute value for an SNMP MIB object and is unable to read and write the SNMP object directly and that does not have a correct value for the SNMP MIB object”.

Examiner respectfully traverses Applicant's arguments:

To the contrary the Grover prior art does teach “a requester that stores an incorrect attribute value for an SNMP MIB object and is unable to read and write the

SNMP object directly and that does not have a correct value for the SNMP MIB object". The Grover prior art is directed to a method for validating the implementation of an object in an object management system. The object management system is accessible over a network and is associated with a network attached device. The object management system includes a management station which runs a manager software and allows a user to query, access and otherwise control the objects in an object structure, such as a MIB (SNMP MIB object), associated with the network attached device. The manager software achieves such control by issuing messages over the network to the agent software associated with the MIB, requesting certain operations be performed on one or more objects. For example, the manager software may request that a particular value be validated in a particular object. It is the agent software's responsibility to ensure that the object allows read/write access (and therefore the manager software has read/write access indirectly through the agent software), and that the manager's request **complies** with all other attributes of the object. If the agent **determines** that the requested operation is not permitted or not valid/verifiable, an error is returned to the manager software. The method includes testing the implementation of the object in the object management system which includes a plurality of objects (SNMP MIB object) and procedures for accessing the objects. The method can automatically identify one or more attributes of a selected object. The method is automatically generates the test signal for testing the identified attribute, the test signal being generated as a function of the attribute. The test signal is communicated over the network to the object management system. If the test signal fails, the failure is reported

(NOTE: if the test signal fails the attribute is the incorrect attribute value and as such the requester (manager software) the does not have a correct value for the SNMP MIB object).

Conclusion

Applicant's amendment necessitated the new ground(s) of rejection presented in this Office action. Accordingly, **THIS ACTION IS MADE FINAL**. See MPEP § 706.07(a). Applicant is reminded of the extension of time policy as set forth in 37 CFR 1.136(a).

A shortened statutory period for reply to this final action is set to expire THREE MONTHS from the mailing date of this action. In the event a first reply is filed within TWO MONTHS of the mailing date of this final action and the advisory action is not mailed until after the end of the THREE-MONTH shortened statutory period, then the shortened statutory period will expire on the date the advisory action is mailed, and any extension fee pursuant to 37 CFR 1.136(a) will be calculated from the mailing date of the advisory action. In no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire later than SIX MONTHS from the date of this final action.

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Charles E. Anya whose telephone number is 571-272-3757. The examiner can normally be reached on 8:30-5:00.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Meng-Ai An can be reached on 571-272-3756. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see http://pair-direct.uspto.gov. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free). If you would like assistance from a USPTO Customer Service Representative or access to the automated information system, call 800-786-9199 (IN USA OR CANADA) or 571-272-1000.

cea.

/VAN H NGUYEN/

Primary Examiner, Art Unit 2194